# Stochastic Geometry Analysis of Normalized SNR-Based Scheduling in Downlink Cellular Networks

Takuya Ohto, Koji Yamamoto, *Member, IEEE,* Seong-Lyun Kim, *Member, IEEE,* Takayuki Nishio, *Member, IEEE,* and Masahiro Morikura, *Member, IEEE*

arXiv:1612.08319v1 [cs.IT] 26 Dec 2016

***Abstract*—The coverage probability and average ergodic rate of normalized SNR-based scheduling in a downlink cellular network are derived by modeling the locations of the base stations and users as two independent Poison point processes. The scheduler selects the user with the largest instantaneous SNR normalized by the average SNR. Our results confirm that normalized SNR scheduling increases the coverage probability due to the multi-user diversity gain.**

***Index Terms*—Stochastic geometry, cellular networks, channel-adaptive scheduling, coverage probability, average ergodic rate.**

## I. Introduction

STOCHASTIC geometry enables the tractable modeling and accurate analysis of cellular networks [1]–[4]. In particular, the coverage probability of a randomly chosen user depending on co-channel interference has been analyzed in a wide variety of scenarios [3], [4]. However, in terms of stochastic geometry analyses, as far as the authors know, no study have been conducted into channel-adaptive scheduling. Even so, it should be noted that channel adaptive scheduling has been analyzed for single-cell network without interference [5].

In this letter, using the framework of stochastic geometry, we derive the coverage probability and average ergodic rate in downlink cellular network with channel-adaptive scheduling, where users experience Rayleigh fading. Although the coverage probability is defined as the probability that a typical user achieves a target signal-to-interference-plus-noise power ratio (SINR), we employ a scheduling scheme based on the SNR normalized by the average SNR [5] as a pilot study of channel-adaptive scheduling, which is able to achieve temporal fairness among users. This scheduling scheme is based on an concept that is similar to proportional fair scheduling (PFS) [6], except that this scheme is based on the normalized SNR rather than the normalized data rate. Henceforth, we refer to this scheduling scheme as *normalized SNR scheduling*. We also evaluate the *scheduling gain* [7], which is defined as the ratio of the average ergodic rate of the normalized SNR scheduling scheme to that of *random scheduling* [1].

Manuscript received **. The associate editor coordinating the review of this letter and approving it for publication was **

T. Ohto, K. Yamamoto (corresponding author), T. Nishio, and M. Morikura are with Graduate School of Informatics, Kyoto University, Kyoto, 606-8501 Japan (e-mail: kyamamot@i.kyoto-u.ac.jp).

S. Kim is with the Radio Resource Management and Optimization Laboratory, School of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Yonsei University, 50 Yonsei-ro, Seodaemun-gu, Seoul 120-749, Korea.

The present study was supported in part by a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C) (no.15K06062) from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS).

Digital Object Identifier ***




Fig. 1: Deployment of BSs and users.

## II. System Model

Our system model of a downlink cellular network consists of both base stations (BSs) and users, as was discussed in [2]. Note that the main difference between our system model and the model in [1] is in considering the user distribution.

*Notation*: $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ denotes the expectation operator, $f_X(\cdot)$ denotes the probability density function (pdf) of a random variable $X$, $F_X(\cdot)$ denotes the cumulative distribution function (cdf) of $X$, $\Gamma(\cdot)$ denotes the gamma function, $Q(x) = (1/\sqrt{2\pi})\int_x^\infty \exp(-t^2/2)\,\mathrm{d}t$ is the standard Gaussian tail probability, and $\mathcal{L}_X(\cdot)$ denotes the Laplace transform of the variable $X$.

The locations of the BSs are assumed to be distributed according to a homogeneous Poisson point process (PPP) $\Phi_\mathrm{b}$ with intensity $\lambda_\mathrm{b}$ on the Euclidean plane $\mathbb{R}^2$. We assume that all the BSs use the identical transmit power $P_\mathrm{b}$. The locations of the users are also assumed to be distributed according to a homogeneous PPP $\Phi_\mathrm{u}$ with intensity $\lambda_\mathrm{u}$. Each user is assumed to be associated with the nearest BS, as was the case in [2]. That is, the cell area of each BS comprises a Voronoi tessellation [8], as shown in Fig. 1. We consider there to be only one resource block to assign, and each BS is assumed to serve only one user in a resource block at any given time.

We assume that the users experience Rayleigh fading. The received power of the user at a distance $r$ from the associated BS is therefore $P_\mathrm{b}hr^{-\alpha}$, where $h$ represents an exponentially

distributed random variable with unit mean, i.e., $h \sim \exp(1)$, and $\alpha > 2$ represents the path loss exponent. The noise power is denoted by $\sigma_{\rm n}^2$.

We consider two scenarios: Scenario 1 where all of the BSs continually transmit signals independently of the number of associated users; and Scenario 2 where a BS that has no users to serve does not transmit any signals. The coverage probability and scheduling gain in the first scenario are discussed in Section III-A, and those in the second scenario are given in Section III-B.

## III. Coverage Probability and Average Ergodic Rate

The coverage probability of the tagged user can be derived as a function of the BS and user densities when normalized SNR scheduling is applied. The coverage probability of a tagged user is the probability that the tagged user can achieve a target SINR $\theta$ when the tagged user is scheduled, which is defined as:

$$p_{\rm c}(\theta, \lambda_{\rm b}, \lambda_{\rm u}) \coloneqq \mathbb{P}(\mathit{SINR} > \theta). \tag{1}$$

Let the number of users in the cell of the BS that serves the tagged user, except for the tagged user, be a random variable $N$, and let the tagged user be located at a random distance $R$ from the associated BS. Conditioning on $N = n$ and $R = r$, the SINR of the tagged user can be written as:

$$\mathit{SINR} = \frac{P_{\rm b} h_{n+1:n+1} r^{-\alpha}}{\sigma_{\rm n}^2 + I}, \tag{2}$$

where $I$ denotes the aggregate interference received at the tagged user, and $h_{n+1:n+1}$ denotes the fading coefficient of the tagged user when the tagged user is scheduled, as explained later in this letter. The tagged user is assumed to be located at $o$, and the location of the associated BS is denoted by $b_o$. In Scenario 1, because all of the BSs continually transmit signals, the aggregate interference $I$ is given by:

$$I = P_{\rm b} \sum_{b \in \Phi_{\rm b} \setminus \{b_o\}} g_b d_b^{-\alpha}, \tag{3}$$

where $g_b$ is the fading coefficient between the tagged user and the BS at $b$, and $d_b$ is the distance from the tagged user to the BS at $b$. In Scenario 2, there might be a BS with no associated user, and thus, the aggregate interference is received only form the active BSs, i.e., BSs that have at least one user to serve.

When the tagged user is scheduled, the coverage probability of the tagged user can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} p_{\rm c}(\theta, \lambda_{\rm b}, \lambda_{\rm u}) &= \mathbb{E}_{R,N}[\mathbb{P}(\mathit{SINR} > \theta \mid r, n)] \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int_0^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(\mathit{SINR} > \theta \mid r, n) f_R(r) f_N(n) \, {\rm d}r, \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $\mathbb{P}(\mathit{SINR} > \theta \mid r, n)$ denotes the coverage probability conditioning on $R = r$ and $N = n$, which is given by the complementary cumulative distribution function (ccdf) of $h_{n+1:n+1}$, $\mathbb{P}(h_{n+1:n+1} > r^{\alpha}\theta(\sigma_{\rm n}^2 + I)/P_{\rm b})$. According to [1], [9], the pdf of $R$ is given by:

$$f_R(r) = 2\pi\lambda_{\rm b} r {\rm e}^{-\pi\lambda_{\rm b} r^2}. \tag{5}$$

In addition, $f_N(n)$ denotes the probability mass function (pmf) of $N$.

**Lemma 1.** The pmf of the number of users in the cell of BS $b_o$, except for the tagged user, $N$, is can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} f_N(n) &\coloneqq \mathbb{P}(N = n) \\ &= \frac{\Gamma(n + c + 1)(\lambda_{\rm u}/c\lambda_{\rm b})^n}{\Gamma(n+1)\Gamma(c+1)(\lambda_{\rm u}/c\lambda_{\rm b} + 1)^{n+c+1}}, \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where $c = 7/2$.

*Proof.* The number of users in the cell of BS $b_o$, except for the tagged user, is equivalent to the number of users in the Voronoi cell to which a randomly chosen point belongs. According to Slivnyak's theorem [10], the locations of the users, except for the tagged user, follow a reduced Palm distribution with the PPP $\Phi_{\rm u}$. Letting the area of the Voronoi cell to which a randomly chosen point belongs normalized by $1/\lambda_{\rm b}$ be denoted by $X$, we have $N \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda_{\rm u} \frac{X}{\lambda_{\rm b}})$. According to [2, Lemma2], the pdf of $X$ is given as:

$$f_X(x) = \frac{c^{c+1}}{\Gamma(c+1)} x^c {\rm e}^{-cx}. \tag{7}$$

Therefore, the pmf of $N$ can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} f_N(n) &= \int_0^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(N = n \mid X = x) \cdot f_X(x) \, {\rm d}x \\ &= \int_0^{\infty} \frac{(\lambda_{\rm u} \frac{x}{\lambda_{\rm b}})^n}{n!} {\rm e}^{-\lambda_{\rm u} \frac{x}{\lambda_{\rm b}}} \cdot \frac{c^{c+1}}{\Gamma(c+1)} x^c {\rm e}^{-cx} \, {\rm d}x \\ &= \frac{c^{c+1}(\lambda_{\rm u}/\lambda_{\rm b})^n}{n!\Gamma(c+1)} \int_0^{\infty} x^{n+c} {\rm e}^{-(\lambda_{\rm u}/\lambda_{\rm b} + c)x} \, {\rm d}x \\ &= \frac{\Gamma(n + c + 1)(\lambda_{\rm u}/c\lambda_{\rm b})^n}{\Gamma(n+1)\Gamma(c+1)(\lambda_{\rm u}/c\lambda_{\rm b} + 1)^{n+c+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Note that Lemma 1 is different from [2, Lemma 1]. The former is the pmf of the number of users in the Voronoi cell of the associated BS, except for the tagged user. The latter is the pmf of the number of users in a typical Voronoi cell.

To evaluate (4), we derive the cdf of the fading coefficient of the tagged user when the tagged user is scheduled, $h_{n+1:n+1}$. Let $i = 1, \ldots, n+1$ be the index of users in the cell of BS $b_o$. Letting the fading coefficient of $i$th user be denoted by $h_i$, $\{h_i\}$ are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) exponential random variables with unit mean. Letting the distance form $i$th user to the associated BS be denoted by $r_i$, the instantaneous SNR of the $i$th user, $\gamma_i$, is given as $\gamma_i = P_{\rm b} h_i r_i^{-\alpha}/\sigma_{\rm n}^2$, and its average SNR, $\bar{\gamma}_i$, is given as $\bar{\gamma}_i \coloneqq \mathbb{E}[\gamma_i] = P_{\rm b} r_i^{-\alpha}/\sigma_{\rm n}^2$. In normalized SNR scheduling, the scheduler selects the user with the largest instantaneous SNR normalized by the average SNR. We obtain $\gamma_i/\bar{\gamma}_i = h_i$. That is, in normalized SNR scheduling, the scheduler selects the user with the largest fading coefficient. The order statistics [11] obtained by arranging the values of $n+1$ $h_i$'s in increasing order of magnitude are denoted as: $h_{1:n+1} < h_{2:n+1} < \cdots < h_{n+1:n+1}$, and the fading coefficient of the tagged user when the tagged user is scheduled is denoted by $h_{n+1:n+1}$. The cdf of $h_{n+1:n+1}$ can be formulated by the same method as the calculation of the

$$p_{\mathrm{c}}(\theta,\lambda_{\mathrm{b}},\lambda_{\mathrm{u}})=\pi\lambda_{\mathrm{b}}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{\Gamma(n+c+1)\left(\frac{\lambda_{\mathrm{u}}}{c\lambda_{\mathrm{b}}}\right)^{n}}{\Gamma(n+1)\Gamma(c+1)\left(\frac{\lambda_{\mathrm{u}}}{c\lambda_{\mathrm{b}}}+1\right)^{n+c+1}}\sum_{k=1}^{n+1}\binom{n+1}{k}(-1)^{k+1}\int_{0}^{\infty}\mathrm{e}^{-\pi\lambda_{\mathrm{b}}v(1+\rho(k\theta,\alpha))-\frac{kv^{\alpha/2}\theta\sigma_{\mathrm{n}}^{2}}{P_{\mathrm{b}}}}\,\mathrm{d}v \quad (9)$$

selection combiner output because in selection combining, the combiner output SNR is the largest SNR of all the branches. According to [12, §7.2.2], the cdf of $h_{n+1:n+1}$ can be written as:

$$F_{h_{n+1:n+1}}(x)=(1-\mathrm{e}^{-x})^{n+1}. \quad (8)$$

### A. Scenario 1: Interference from all BSs

In this scenario, all BSs continually transmit signals regardless of the number of associated users, and the tagged user receives interference from all BSs, except for its associated BS. Substituting (5), (6), and (8) into (4), we obtain $p_{\mathrm{c}}(\theta,\lambda_{\mathrm{b}},\lambda_{\mathrm{u}})$, as follows:

**Theorem 1.** In normalized SNR scheduling, the coverage probability is given by (9), where

$$\rho(k\theta,\alpha)=(k\theta)^{2/\alpha}\int_{(k\theta)^{-2/\alpha}}^{\infty}\frac{1}{1+u^{\alpha/2}}\,\mathrm{d}u. \quad (10)$$

The proof of this theorem is provided in the Appendix.

To simplify this expression, we consider a special case as in [1]. Assuming $\sigma_{\mathrm{n}}^2=0$ and $\alpha=4$, the expression of the coverage probability can be simplified to:

$$p_{\mathrm{c}}(\theta,\lambda_{\mathrm{b}},\lambda_{\mathrm{u}})=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}f_N(n)\sum_{k=1}^{n+1}\frac{\binom{n+1}{k}(-1)^{k+1}}{1+\sqrt{k\theta}(\pi/2-\arctan(1/\sqrt{k\theta}))}. \quad (11)$$

In this case, the coverage probability depends only on the target SINR $\theta$ and the ratio of the density of users to that of BSs, $\lambda_{\mathrm{u}}/\lambda_{\mathrm{b}}$.

Here, we evaluate the scheduling gain of normalized SNR scheduling. Based on the idea described in [7], the scheduling gain is defined as $G(\lambda_{\mathrm{b}},\lambda_{\mathrm{u}}) \coloneqq \tau_{\mathrm{s}}(\lambda_{\mathrm{b}},\lambda_{\mathrm{u}})/\tau_{\mathrm{r}}(\lambda_{\mathrm{b}})$, where $\tau_{\mathrm{s}}(\lambda_{\mathrm{b}},\lambda_{\mathrm{u}})$ and $\tau_{\mathrm{r}}(\lambda_{\mathrm{b}})$ denote the average ergodic rates of normalized SNR scheduling and random scheduling, respectively. The average ergodic rate is defined as the mean rate in units of nats/Hz for the tagged user, which is assumed to achieve the Shannon bound at its instantaneous SINR, and $\tau_{\mathrm{r}}(\lambda_{\mathrm{b}})$ is derived in [1].

We obtain $\tau_{\mathrm{s}}(\lambda_{\mathrm{b}},\lambda_{\mathrm{u}})$ as follows:

**Theorem 2.** The average ergodic rate of normalized SNR scheduling can be written as:

$$\tau_{\mathrm{s}}(\lambda_{\mathrm{b}},\lambda_{\mathrm{u}})=\pi\lambda_{\mathrm{b}}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}f_N(n)\int_0^{\infty}\int_0^{\infty}\sum_{k=1}^{n+1}\binom{n+1}{k}\cdot(-1)^{k+1}\mathrm{e}^{-\pi\lambda_{\mathrm{b}}v(1+\rho(k(\mathrm{e}^{t}-1),\alpha))-\frac{kv^{\alpha/2}\theta\sigma_{\mathrm{n}}^{2}}{P_{\mathrm{b}}}}\,\mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}v. \quad (12)$$

*Proof.* We have:

$$\tau_{\mathrm{s}}(\lambda_{\mathrm{b}},\lambda_{\mathrm{u}}) \coloneqq \mathbb{E}[\ln(1+SINR)]=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}f_N(n)\int_0^{\infty}f_R(r)\cdot\int_0^{\infty}\mathbb{P}\left(\ln\left(1+\frac{P_{\mathrm{b}}h_{n+1:n+1}r^{-\alpha}}{\sigma_{\mathrm{n}}^2+I}\right)>t\right)\mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}r.$$

The rest of the proof is similar to that for [1, Theorem 3] and Theorem 1. □

In the case of $\sigma_{\mathrm{n}}^2=0$ and $\alpha=4$, the expression (12) can be simplified to:

$$\tau_{\mathrm{s}}(\lambda_{\mathrm{b}},\lambda_{\mathrm{u}})=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}f_N(n)\int_0^{\infty}\sum_{k=1}^{n+1}\binom{n+1}{k}\cdot\frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{1+\sqrt{k(\mathrm{e}^{t}-1)}(\pi/2-\arctan(1/\sqrt{k(\mathrm{e}^{t}-1)}))}\,\mathrm{d}t.$$

### B. Scenario 2: Interference only from active BSs

We now consider the scenario where a BS that has no user to serve does not transmit any signals, as in [2]. In this scenario, the aggregate interference originates only from the active BSs, except for the BS associated with the tagged user. Because the received power at the tagged user from the associated BS follows the identical distribution in both scenarios, and the density of the active BS is reduced from $\lambda_{\mathrm{b}}$ to $\lambda_{\mathrm{b}}(1-(1+\lambda_{\mathrm{u}}/c\lambda_{\mathrm{b}})^{-c})$ in Scenario 2, according to [2, Lemma 3], we obtain the coverage probability in scenario 2 by substituting $(1-(1+\lambda_{\mathrm{u}}/c\lambda_{\mathrm{b}})^{-c})\rho(k\theta,\alpha)$ for $\rho(k\theta,\alpha)$ in (9).

We then derive the scheduling gain $G(\lambda_{\mathrm{b}},\lambda_{\mathrm{u}})$ in Scenario 2. We obtain the average ergodic rate of normalized SNR scheduling by substituting $(1-(1+\lambda_{\mathrm{u}}/c\lambda_{\mathrm{b}})^{-c})\rho(k(\mathrm{e}^{t}-1),\alpha)$ for $\rho(k(\mathrm{e}^{t}-1),\alpha)$ in (12). We also obtain the average ergodic rate of random scheduling by using [2, Lemma 3].

## IV. Numerical Examples

We investigate the coverage probability and scheduling gain through numerical examples. To confirm the impact of channel-adaptive scheduling on the performance of cellular networks, we compare the coverage probability of the scheduled user in normalized SNR scheduling with that of a randomly scheduled user [1].

Fig. 2 shows the coverage probability in Scenario 1, (11) when $\sigma_{\mathrm{n}}^2=0$ and $\alpha=4$. Normalized SNR scheduling provides a higher coverage probability than random scheduling. In normalized SNR scheduling, the coverage probability increases along with $\lambda_{\mathrm{u}}/\lambda_{\mathrm{b}}$. This is because normalized SNR scheduling exploits multi-user diversity gain.

In addition, to validate our formulation, we conducted a Monte Carlo simulation. Fig. 2 also shows that simulation results exactly coincide with (11).

Fig. 3 shows the scheduling gain in each scenario when $\sigma_{\mathrm{n}}^2=0$ and $\alpha=4$. The scheduling gain increases along with $\lambda_{\mathrm{u}}/\lambda_{\mathrm{b}}$ due to the multi-user diversity gain. The scheduling gain in Scenario 1 is larger than that in Scenario 2 because, although the same multi-user diversity gain is exploited in each scenario, the aggregate interference in Scenario 1 is larger than that in Scenario 2.




Fig. 2: Coverage probability $p_{\mathrm{c}}$ for $\sigma_{\mathrm{n}}^2 = 0$, and $\alpha = 4$.




Fig. 3: Scheduling gain $G$ for $\sigma_{\mathrm{n}}^2 = 0$, and $\alpha = 4$.

## V. Conclusion

This letter derived the coverage probability and average ergodic rate of normalized SNR scheduling as a basic channel-adaptive scheduling scheme in cellular networks. The distribution of the fading coefficient with the normalized SNR scheduler has been shown to be equivalent to that of selection combining, which enabled derivation of the coverage probability and average ergodic rate of the tagged user when the tagged user is scheduled. This approach can be applied when fading coefficients are i.i.d. with respect to the BS and the user indices. In the case of $\alpha = 4$ and no noise, the coverage probability is only dependent on the target SINR and the ratio of the density of users to that of BSs, $\lambda_{\mathrm{u}}/\lambda_{\mathrm{b}}$. Numerical results confirmed that normalized SNR scheduling provides a higher coverage probability along with $\lambda_{\mathrm{u}}/\lambda_{\mathrm{b}}$ because of the multi-user diversity gain. It was also confirmed that the scheduling gain increased along with $\lambda_{\mathrm{u}}/\lambda_{\mathrm{b}}$.

## Appendix

We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(SINR > \theta \mid r, n) &= \mathbb{P}(h_{n+1:n+1} > r^{\alpha}\theta(\sigma_{\mathrm{n}}^2 + I)/P_{\mathrm{b}}) \\
&= 1 - \int_0^{\infty} F_{h_{n+1:n+1}}(r^{\alpha}\theta(\sigma_{\mathrm{n}}^2 + z)/P_{\mathrm{b}}) f_I(z)\,\mathrm{d}z \\
&= 1 - \int_0^{\infty} \left(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{r^{\alpha}\theta(\sigma_{\mathrm{n}}^2+z)}{P_{\mathrm{b}}}}\right)^{n+1} f_I(z)\,\mathrm{d}z \\
&\overset{(a)}{=} 1 - \sum_{k=0}^{n+1} \binom{n+1}{k} (-1)^k \int_0^{\infty} \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{kr^{\alpha}\theta(\sigma_{\mathrm{n}}^2+z)}{P_{\mathrm{b}}}} f_I(z)\,\mathrm{d}z \\
&= 1 - \sum_{k=0}^{n+1} \binom{n+1}{k} (-1)^k \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{kr^{\alpha}\theta\sigma_{\mathrm{n}}^2}{P_{\mathrm{b}}}} \mathbb{E}_I\left[\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{kr^{\alpha}\theta I}{P_{\mathrm{b}}}}\right] \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{n+1} \binom{n+1}{k} (-1)^{k+1} \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{kr^{\alpha}\theta\sigma_{\mathrm{n}}^2}{P_{\mathrm{b}}}} \mathcal{L}_I(kr^{\alpha}\theta/P_{\mathrm{b}}).
\end{aligned}$$

(a) is obtained from the binomial theorem, and enables the derivation according to the approach in [1]. We assume that interference experiences Rayleigh fading, and thus, according to [1, Theorem 2], $\mathcal{L}_I(kr^{\alpha}\theta/P_{\mathrm{b}})$ is can be written as:

$$\mathcal{L}_I(kr^{\alpha}\theta/P_{\mathrm{b}}) = \exp(-\pi r^2 \lambda_{\mathrm{b}} \rho(k\theta, \alpha)), \tag{13}$$

where

$$\rho(k\theta, \alpha) = (k\theta)^{2/\alpha} \int_{(k\theta)^{-2/\alpha}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1 + u^{\alpha/2}}\,\mathrm{d}u. \tag{14}$$

By using the substitution $r^2 \to v$, the coverage probability becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
p_{\mathrm{c}}(\theta, \lambda_{\mathrm{b}}, \lambda_{\mathrm{u}}) = \pi\lambda_{\mathrm{b}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} f_N(n) \sum_{k=1}^{n+1} \binom{n+1}{k} (-1)^{k+1} \\
\cdot \int_0^{\infty} \mathrm{e}^{-\pi\lambda_{\mathrm{b}} v(1+\rho(k\theta,\alpha)) - \frac{kv^{\alpha/2}\theta\sigma_{\mathrm{n}}^2}{P_{\mathrm{b}}}}\,\mathrm{d}v.
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

## References


[1] J. G. Andrews, F. Baccelli, and R. K. Ganti, "A tractable approach to coverage and rate in cellular networks," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 59, no. 11, pp. 3122–3134, Nov. 2011.

[2] S. M. Yu and S.-L. Kim, "Downlink capacity and base station density in cellular networks," in *Proc. Int. Symp. Modeling Optim. Mobile, Ad Hoc, Wireless Netw. (WiOpt)*, Tsukuba, Japan, May 2013, pp. 119–124.

[3] H. ElSawy, E. Hossain, and M. Haenggi, "Stochastic geometry for modeling, analysis, and design of multi-tier and cognitive cellular wireless networks: A survey," *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 996–1019, June 2013.

[4] H. ElSawy, A. Sultan-Salem, M.-S. Alouini, and M. Z. Win, "Modeling and analysis of cellular networks using stochastic geometry: A tutorial," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1604.03689*, 2016.

[5] L. Yang and M.-S. Alouini, "Performance analysis of multiuser selection diversity," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 55, no. 6, pp. 1848–1861, Nov. 2006.

[6] P. Viswanath, D. N. C. Tse, and R. Laroia, "Opportunistic beamforming using dumb antennas," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 48, no. 6, pp. 1277–1294, June 2002.

[7] F. Berggren and R. Jantti, "Asymptotically fair transmission scheduling over fading channels," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 326–336, Jan. 2004.

[8] A. Okabe, B. Boots, K. Sugihara, and S. N. Chiu, *Spatial Tessellations: Concepts and Applications of Voronoi Diagrams*. John Wiley & Sons, 2009.

[9] M. Haenggi, *Stochastic Geometry for Wireless Networks*. Cambridge Univ. Pr., 2012.

[10] S. N. Chiu, D. Stoyan, W. S. Kendall, and J. Mecke, *Stochastic geometry and its applications*. John Wiley & Sons, 2013.

[11] H. A. David and H. N. Nagaraja, *Order Statistics*. Wiley Online Library, 1981.

[12] A. Goldsmith, *Wireless Communications*. Cambridge Univ. Pr., 2005.